

Memo

To: Shana Davis-Cook, Village Manager
From: Michael Younes, Director of Municipal Operations *my*
CC: Board of Managers
John Fitzgerald, Chief of Police
Demetri Protos, Finance Director
Adventino Dasilva, Police Sergeant
Eric Tiedemann, Police Corporal
Date: 10/28/11
Re: Award Recommendation – Automated Traffic Enforcement, Collection and Violation Processing System (*SafeSpeed* Program)

Two (2) proposals were received, as a result of the publicly advertised Request for Proposals (RFP) for the performance of an Automated Traffic Enforcement, Collection and Violation Processing System in support of the Village's *SafeSpeed* Program. In order to ensure an appropriate level of review and scrutiny was given for this contract, a "Proposal Evaluation Committee" was established to review, rate and recommend contract award. The Proposal Evaluation Committee (the Committee) comprised of Shana Davis-Cook, Adventino Dasilva, Demetri Protos, Eric Tiedemann and me. Based on the evaluation matrix and criteria listed below **we recommend contract award to ACS State and Local Solutions, Inc. (the Contractor).**

Due to the fact that the Village was currently in the process of selecting a new Chief of Police and the need to ensure that the Village's *SafeSpeed* Program ran uninterrupted the Committee has provided a copy of its review findings to Chief Fitzgerald along with a copy of this memorandum for his review and comment prior to requesting contract approval from the Board of Managers. Under a separate memorandum Chief Fitzgerald will provide his recommendation and/or concurrence of the Committee's review to the Board for its consideration.



Background

The Contractor has demonstrated their knowledge and competence through their submitted proposal, and has been extremely receptive in all previous conversations. The Contractor has extensive experience providing photo enforcement and related support services throughout the country. The Contractor has become an industry leader in photo traffic enforcement and collection/payment processing systems throughout the country with over 30 years of experience.

Evaluation Matrix

<i>Rating scale: (1 to 10, 10 being the best)</i>		ACS State and Local Solutions, Inc.	The Brekford Corporation
Responsiveness of the Proposal		10	2
Clearly Outlined Scope of Work		9	2.5
Technical Experience		9	5
Management Plan		8	3
Maintenance Plan		9	7
Experience in Municipal Traffic Enforcement Programs		9	3
Credentials of Service Technicians		8	1
Credentials of Management Team		8.5	7
Violation Processing System		9	4
Collection and Payment Processing Plans		10	3.5
Ease of Understanding Data Reports		9	6
Clarity of Sample Violation Images		9	7
Service Level Commitments		10	6.5
Level of Training on Camera and Processing System		10	9
		-----	-----
Total		127.5	66.5

Responsiveness of the Proposal

As part of the Contractor's submitted proposal all required materials and questions as stipulated in the RFP were addressed successfully. The Village also received a second proposal from The Brekford Corporation (Brekford). This second proposal included many but not all required documents, many required questions were not addressed and had to be requested in order to fairly evaluate their proposal. Even after an initial request was made to

address questions regarding the proposal, a second request was required to address additional questions and missing items.

In reviewing both proposals the Committee noted that the Contractor's proposal clearly and methodically addressed every item required by the Village. The proposal submitted by Brekford lacked the ability to follow the requirements of the RFP. As a result of the factor mentioned in this section the Contractor was scored at a 10 and Brekford was scored at a rating of 2 out of a possible 10 points.

Understanding of Scope of Work

In combination with the responsiveness of the submitted proposal the Contractor clearly understood the scope of work that the Village required and what was expected. The Committee recognized that the Contractor recommended in this memorandum is the Village's current contractor; however, various items were modified in the RFP to address issues and concerns with the current contract such as turnaround times for reports, technical assistance and data processing requirements. The Committee had a couple minor questions regarding the Contractor's ability to make modifications to its violation and payment processing systems. The Contractor was able to address the Committee's questions and the Committee was pleased with the level of response it received. Accordingly, the Committee rated the Contractor at 9 out of 10.

The Committee had strong concerns over the lack of understanding of the scope of work from Brekford, especially since the Managing Director for Brekford's photo enforcement section is a former Montgomery County Police employee who served as the program implementation manager for the County's speed camera program. All members of the Committee shared this concern since the Village's speed camera program was implemented with Montgomery County in 2007 and this particular person routinely coordinated with the Village. As the Committee reviewed the proposal submitted by Brekford, it was clear that the proposal outlined what Brekford "believes" the Village wants and not how Brekford's system related and could be adapted to the Village requirements. It was for this factor, the lack of a complete submitted proposal and concerns about Brekford's Managing Director that the Committee rated Brekford at 2.5 out of 10.

Technical Experience

The Committee felt that one of the most important factors in reviewing and recommending a contractor for the performance of this technologically dependant contract is their technical experience. The Contractor has over 30 years of direct experience in photo enforcement programs and related technologies. Over this period the Contractor has demonstrated their ability to install, troubleshoot and maintain various types of camera systems. During this same period the Contractor also has extensive experience in violation and payment processing operations. The Committee felt that this experience was invaluable and ensures that the Village's *SafeSpeed* program is supported in the most efficient and up-to-date manner as possible in the traffic enforcement and payment processing industries. The Committee rated the Contractor's technical experience at 9 out of 10. The Committee did not rate the Contractor perfectly because we believed that no single contractor could have all available experience required to support the performance of such a program.

The Committee reviewed the technical experience of Brekford and felt that although Brekford had showed that they now have experience with photo enforcement technology that many of the main processing services were sub-contracted. The major concern the Committee had was whether Brekford would be able to handle the demands/volume of the Village's well established *SafeSpeed* program given Brekford's limited experience in photo enforcement programs. The Committee was also concerned with Brekford's lack of experience in photo speed enforcement systems using LIDAR (laser speed detection). Accordingly, we rated Brekford at 5 out of 10 because they have the basic experience, but lack of experience and operational longevity.

Management Plan

As part of the RFP the proposers were required to submit a plan to manage their operations in support of this contract. The Committee was able to clearly understand how this contract would be managed from the Contractor's level. The Contractor's proposal outlined every aspect of the program, who would serve as project manager for the overall program and each business unit (i.e., implementation, maintenance, customer service and financial). One concern the Committee had while evaluating the Contractor's proposal was that under the current contract the Contractor's project manager occasionally found themselves overwhelmed with multiple requests from different agencies which sometimes caused a delayed response time to the Village's requests. The Committee has noticed that recently these situations have not occurred as frequently as more staff has been brought in to assist. The Committee acknowledged these steps and statements within the proposal to bring more staff to the table should it be necessary, however, recognizing the concern, the Contractor was rated at 8 out of 10.

Unfortunately, Brekford's proposal included a flow chart with no supporting explanation on how they would manage the Village's contract. This lack of explanation led the Committee to feel that Brekford's proposal was written in a manner that said: "we have done this before so you should trust us". Accordingly, Brekford was rated at 3 out of 10.

Maintenance Plan

Ensuring that all elements of this technologically demanding contract are maintained is an important aspect to selecting the right contractor. Both proposals outlined a clear maintenance plan regarding both emergency and preventative maintenance, and for recording and reporting what maintenance was performed. Both proposals met the Village's requirements for on-site technical support services (2 hours) and repair/replacement of malfunctioning equipment (24 hours).

In rating the two (2) proposals, the Committee noted a couple differences related to maintenance. The Contractor's proposal described and outlined how its "computer maintenance management system" or CMMS would efficiently catalog, report and flag problem areas. Throughout Brekford's proposal a description of the system was given in generalities, but not related to the Village's specific needs. Another concern the Committee had was Brekford's ability to meet the equipment replacement requirement. Brekford stated that they have a close relationship with the camera manufactures, but it was unclear how this

interaction would take place to replace or repair equipment. There was no mention of how many service technicians would be available. Accordingly, Brekford was rated at 7 out of 10.

The Contractor's proposal clearly outlined how their CMMS would be used in support of the Village's *SafeSpeed* program. Because the Contractor is currently under contract with many other jurisdictions in the State that are using the same technology, spare and replacement parts would be more readily available for repairs therefore reducing camera down-time. One concern acknowledged was that at times the current Contractor sometimes was unable to respond/mitigate problems in a timely manner. With the increased number of contracts throughout the State using the same camera equipment the Committee has observed a decrease in these issues. Based on the factors above the Contractor was rated at 9 out of 10.

Experience in Municipal Traffic Enforcement Programs

While evaluating the proposals the Committee clearly saw that the Contractor's experience in municipal traffic enforcement programs was far superior to that of Brekford's. The Contractor has over 30 years of municipal traffic enforcement experience in over 30 cities, counties and states for photo speed and red light enforcement programs. The Committee rated the Contractor's experience at 9 out of 10. The Committee did not rate the Contractor perfectly because we thought that no single contractor could have all the experience.

Brekford has very limited direct experience totaling approximately one-year in municipal traffic enforcement programs and has only four (4) contracts for photo speed enforcement. Accordingly, Brekford was rated at 3 out of 10.

Credentials of Service Technicians

Along with proper maintenance it is important to have qualified service technicians maintaining and troubleshooting this technology-dependant contract. The Committee was once again in agreement that the Contractor's proposal clearly outlined the credentials of its service personnel and is more qualified than Brekford. The Contractor has provided resumes for its service managers with over 15 years of service related experience. The Contractor's maintenance plan clearly outlines how its service technicians have been trained to ensure continuity of operations. One concern the Committee had regarding the service technicians is that in the past the Contractor has been slow to train new technicians sometimes leading to delays in problem resolution; however, with the increase in the number of contracts throughout the State the Committee has observed a noticeable increase in well-trained technicians available to support of the Village's *SafeSpeed* program. Accordingly, the Contractor was rated at 8 out of 10.

Once again Brekford's proposal was lacking any description of qualifications for their service personnel. Brekford did include how its service technicians would be integrated into its maintenance plan; however, execution of a plan is only one aspect, and in this contract properly trained personnel is key. The Committee rated Brekford's service technician credentials at 1 out of 10.

Credentials of Management Team

Just like properly trained service technicians it is important to have qualified personnel managing a contract of this magnitude for a contractor. Included in the Contractor's proposal were full resumes for all key managerial personnel that would be assigned to the contract. The managerial personnel who would be assigned to the Village's contract have a combined 70 years in managerial, photo enforcement, systems integration, financial and program implementation experience. The Committee felt that this amount of experience was an invaluable tool that will ensure the Village's *SafeSpeed* program is properly supported at a high level by the Contractor. One concern noted was that at times over the life of the Village's current contract the Contractor has been unable to address the Village's concerns in a timely manner due to other commitments. With the increased number of contracts throughout the State necessitating additional staff and the addition of a second point of contact, the Committee has seen increased responsiveness and was not concerned that past problems would resurface. Accordingly, the Contractor was rated at 8.5 out of 10.

Brekford included a listing of its top personnel who would serve as the management team for the Village's contract, but did not include resumes. Like the Contractor, Brekford's managerial personnel are near the top of their fields as well. As mentioned in a previous section titled "Understanding of Scope of Work", Brekford's Managing Director has direct work experience implementing Montgomery County's speed camera program in 2007. However, based on the proposal submitted, Brekford only has one other person on staff with managerial experience in the photo enforcement industry. Brekford listed three (3) other people as "partners" with experience in photo enforcement programs that the Committee has assumed, due to a lack of explanation, that work for other agencies or companies. While the Committee recognizes that collectively Brekford's managers have very good credentials but without further explanation of their education and experience the Committee had concerns rating Brekford higher. Accordingly, the Committee rated Brekford's managerial team credentials at 7 out of 10.

Violation Processing System

Based on the Contractor's submitted proposal the Committee was able to clearly understand how specific components of the violation processing system worked and how the system would support the Village's *SafeSpeed* program. The Contractor's submitted proposal clearly outlined how Village personnel would interact with the citation approval process system called "citeweb" and the different steps available to Village personnel when reviewing potential citations. Available to the Village if we choose is the functionality to conduct a supervisory review on rejected citations, the Village does not currently use this function but could. For example, if the Village's approving officer rejected a citation because he could not read the license plate number, the supervisory review would allow a supervisor (also a Village Police Officer) to review rejected citations to provide an independent opinion on approval or rejection. In addition to a supervisory review on rejected citations the Committee asked the Contractor if it would be possible to create a supervisory step for approved citations. The Contractor responded that it was possible to modify its violation processing system to accommodate a supervisory review for approvals if the Village requested the functionality. If the Village wished to pursue the modification the Village would have to ensure that this extra approval step would be able to be achieved while still meeting State law requirements for

mailing approved citations. The Committee rated the Contractors violation processing system at 9 out of 10. The Committee did not rate the Contractor perfectly because we thought that no single system would be perfect and could always be improved.

Unfortunately, the proposal submitted by Brekford was lacking in the amount of explanation provided regarding its violation processing system. The Committee again had concerns that the proposal did not describe all of the required processing steps as stipulated in the RFP. Again, the Committee did not receive a sense that Brekford understood the scope of work required by the Village and Brekford took the approach of "just trust us". Brekford's citation approval system is called "COPS2000" however; the proposal provided very little description about how the system worked and what functionality was available. Because Brekford did address portions of the violation processing system in their submitted proposal, the Committee rated Brekford at 4 out of 10.

Collection and Payment Processing Plans

The Committee once again was in agreement that the Contractor had a far superior collection and payment processing system. The Contractor originally started in the payment processing and collection industry over 30 years ago. This experience was very evident in reviewing their submitted proposal. The Committee was impressed at the technology employed by the Contractor to ensure that all received payments are processed accurately and efficiently. Through the use of specialized equipment received payments are opened, cataloged, imaged and sorted for deposit into Village accounts. The Contractor's system would image all documents received including the received envelope, both sides of the payment, and citation. All of the payment processing services are conducted in the Contractor's facilities, and all courier services used to carry mail to and from the U.S. Post Office and banking deposits are bonded and insured. The Contractor's proposal also clearly outlines return payment procedures and daily interfacing with Village accounting systems. Due to the extensive experience the Contractor has with collection and payment processing plans, the Contractor was rated at 10 out of 10.

Once again the Committee had major concerns with Brekford's submitted proposal regarding the collection and processing of citation payments. Unlike the Contractor, Brekford states that many of the collection and payment processing operations would be subcontracted to—based on the Committee's count—up to a total of five (5) subcontractors, two of which the Committee was unable to identify and evaluate their credentials. Due to the high number of subcontractors proposed by Brekford, Village citations would be traveling to and from multiple locations outside the county to be collected, imaged, processed and later deposited into Village accounts. Unlike the Contractor, Brekford would not be conducting many of the collection and payment processing operations with its own personnel. The Committee also had a particular concern and issue with one statement that Brekford made in its proposal, specifically, "we will compare the return document to the check and add or change information on the document whenever it is appropriate". In the view of the Committee it is never appropriate for Brekford to change any documents when processing payments. Based on the factors above and the fact that Brekford did submit a plan to process and collect citation payments, the Committee rated Brekford at 3.5 out of 10.

Ease of Understanding Data Reports

Another key to ensuring the Village's *SafeSpeed* program runs effectively and efficiently is through our review of various data reports generated by the system. The RFP required each proposer to submit sample reports. Unfortunately, the Contractor was the only Proposer that submitted the required sample reports. The Committee was able to clearly understand what the data was and how it was presented. All reports are available for review and creation via the in which citations are approved (called "citeweb") and are available in multiple file formats. The Contractor has also offered to create and customize any reports the Village feels it requires to best serve our *SafeSpeed* program. One key tool in ensuring the camera systems are working properly is providing reports that outline the reasons why certain citations are being rejected. For example, if the Village is noticing that the violation images' clarity is low resulting in an increased amount of rejected citations, the Village would be able to show determine and/or the Contractor would be able to proactively discover potential issues with a specific camera that need to be addressed. Accordingly, the Committee rated the Contractor at 9 out of 10 because, as mentioned before, there are always ways to improve a reporting system.

As stipulated in the RFP, sample reports were required to be submitted the proposer's proposal, unfortunately, Brekford neglected to include any reports in its submitted proposal instead submitting only a description of its reporting capabilities. Only after a supplemental request did Brekford submit sample reports. Once received the Committee found the reports hard to read and confusing. Unlike the Contractor, Brekford made no mention of their ability to customize reports at the Village's request and the reports appeared not to breakdown how violations may have been rejected by the Village or contractor. All of the reports submitted only showed final or bottom line numbers with no explanation on how they were achieved. Based on the factors above, the Committee rated Brekford at 6 of out 10.

Clarity of Sample Violation Images

The most important aspect of this contract is the violation images taken by the contractor's camera system. As stipulated in the RFP, the proposers were required to submit sample violation images for review by the Committee. Both the Contractor and Brekford submitted sample images in their submitted proposals. The Committee was impressed that the Contractor submitted sample images taken at night, in the rain, snow and during normal driving conditions as well as an explanation on how the images are taken. One concern the Committee had stems from a current issue that the Village and the Contractor have been discussing over the past six (6) months that involves a thin line that is overlaid on the violation images to serve as a reference scale if needed. Occasionally, the reference scale will line up through the license plate letters/numbers, even though the citation is still valid, Village policy has been to reject any citations where this occurs. This issue has not been a large problem but has occurred. The Committee asked the Contractor about the issue and received a similar response as before that the Contractor is currently working on a solution to give the jurisdiction the option of hiding the line, but currently no solution exists. It was because of this fact that the Contractor was rated at 9 out of 10.

Brekford submitted sample violation images with their submitted proposal. Although not required there was no explanation on how the images were taken. The Committee also

noted that all except for one of the sample violation images were taken during normal daylight driving conditions. The daylight images submitted appeared to be clear; however, the one nighttime image was grainy. Accordingly, the Committee rated Brekford at 7 out of 10.

Service Level Commitments

Ensuring the level of service required by the Village, its residents and those who travel or interact with our interests are paramount. Both submitted proposals addressed how each contractor would address the Village's required service level requirements. The Contractor's proposal clearly outlined how they would meet or exceed the Village's service level requirements and further proposed to provide the Village with monthly system reports to validate that they have met our requirements. As stipulated in the RFP, the Contractor must ensure less than a 3% lost or dropped call-rate per month; however, the Contractor expressed concern that dropped calls for reasons outside of the control of the contractor are inevitable (i.e., if the caller changes their mind or phone issues on the caller's side) and may result in a higher lost/dropped call-rate. The Committee acknowledged this concern and determined that the Contractor would not be held responsible for dropped calls due to reasons outside the Contract's control. Accordingly, the Contractor was rated at 10 out of 10.

The Committee felt that Brekford's proposal did not adequately address the Village's requirements as stipulated in the RFP. Brekford again has provided statements that strongly concern the Committee that Brekford would have problems complying with Village requirements. In this case Brekford states that they will within 15 day of contract award provide the Village for approval a report on how Brekford would comply with the Village's requirements through the life of the contract. The Committee agreed that this type of document or assurance should have been submitted with their proposal for evaluation. Accordingly, the Committee rated Brekford at 6.5 out of 10.

Training Available

In order to properly operate any speed camera equipment, personnel must be trained as required by the Maryland Annotated Code, Transportation Article, § 21-809. Both submitted proposals outlined the basic training elements given and provided a sample training manual; however, Brekford's training manual was not included in the original proposal, but was submitted as an addendum. Both proposers would be providing an appropriate level of training on the camera system and related components including their respective violation processing systems. Based on the Committee's review of the proposed training materials both were complete, although the Contractor was rated at 10 out of 10 in recognition that the submission requirement was met when the original proposal was submitted, and Brekford was rated at 9 out of 10 due to its delayed submission.

Cost Schedule

As stipulated in the RFP the Village requested that the proposers provide pricing options based on 3 different scenarios and delinquent collections processing. Accordingly, below please find a summary of the pricing options submitted:

Compensation Options	ACS State and Local Solutions, Inc.		The Brekford Corporation	
Flat Monthly Fee	Total of \$58,000 per month (4 cameras)		Total of \$132,00 per month (4 cameras)	
Per Paid Citation	# of Citations	Fee	\$14.75	
	0-1000	\$18.95		
	1001-2000	\$17.95		
	2001-3000	\$16.95		
	3000+	\$15.95		
Alternative Pricing Model	\$16,000 per month + \$11.95 per issued citation		# of Citations	% of paid Citation
			0-3,500	39.5%
			3,501-4,500	36.5%
			4,500+	33.5%
Delinquent Collections Fee (percentage based on collected amount)	30%		39.5%	

Based on current and estimated future numbers of issued and paid citations we recommend that the Board authorize contract award using the flat monthly fee pricing structure (highlighted in red) and 30% delinquent collections processing fee submitted by the Contractor for the following reasons:

1. Of the three (3) options proposed the flat monthly fee option is the most economical and in the Village's best interest based on current and future citation numbers.
2. The proposed flat fee is \$27,000 less per month than what the Village is currently compensating (\$85,000 per month) the Contractor for its support services.
3. The flat monthly fee option would only be un- economical if the Village experienced an 11% (or greater) decrease in the number of issued and fully paid citations. As outlined in the Contractor's proposal, with the upgrade of the four (4) existing cameras to the next generation camera systems, a 10% - 15% increase in eligible citations is estimated. This increase is consistent with what other jurisdictions have observed with the upgraded camera systems.
4. Based on current and estimated future numbers of issued and paid citations the option to compensate the Contractor based on a "per paid citation" basis would not be economical and would result in further costs to the Village. (See bullet #3 above.)

5. The alternative pricing model proposed is not in the Village's best interest insomuch as the flat monthly fee model is calculated by multiplying the number of issued citations by \$11.95. This pricing model presents a potential problem because the Contractor's compensation could be interpreted as being tied to the number of citations issued even though the Village has the final approval on which citations are approved and therefore issued.

Although Brekford submitted more favorable pricing for the per-paid-citation payment structure, the Committee collectively agreed that based on the cumulative rating and evaluation of their proposal, Contract award to Brekford would not be in the Village's best interest.

Piggybacking the County Contract

Like the Village, Montgomery County (the County) has been in the process of re-bidding its contract in support of its speed camera program. In October, the County signed a new contract with ACS to support its *SafeSpeed* program which could run through November 2018, if all County extension years are exercised.

Upon review of the County contract the Committee felt that the County contract did not provide the Village with the same level of protection and responsiveness as outlined in the Village's RFP. The Village's RFP includes for several liquidated damages provisions that automatically kick-in if the Contractor fails to perform up to the required standards. While the County contract includes liquidated damages provisions, the Village's language carries higher damages. Another major difference is that compensation under the County's contract is paid on a "per-paid-citation" basis. By piggybacking on the County's contract under its per-paid-citation payment structure, the Village would be paying between 5% - 20% more based on citation volumes than the Committee's recommended flat fee compensation structure with the Contractor.

Based on the above factors the Committee recommends that the Village proceed with its own contract with the Contractor to support our *SafeSpeed* program operations.


Recommendation

Upon review and analysis of the documents submitted by all proposers, technical experience, size and structure of the company and a favorable assessment by references submitted by the proposer, we recommend contract award to ACS State and Local Solutions, Inc. in performance of an automated traffic enforcement, collection and violations processing system to support the Village's *SafeSpeed* program, using the flat monthly fee option and 30% delinquent collections processing fee.

As is the policy with all contracts, Village Counsel has reviewed the enclosed contract (Tab C.) and has approved all contractual terms.



Memo

To: Shana Davis-Cook, Village Manager
From: John Fitzgerald, Chief of Police 
CC: Board of Managers
Michael Younes, Director of Municipal Operations
Demetri Protos, Finance Director
Adventino Dasilva, Police Sergeant
Eric Tiedemann, Police Corporal
Date: 12/8/2011
Re: Endorsement of Proposal Evaluation Committee's *SafeSpeed* Contract Award Recommendation

In response to a request for proposals published by the Village, two firms submitted proposals—ACS State & Local Solutions, Inc. (ACS), and The Brekford Corporation (Brekford). By memorandum dated October 28, 2011, the Village's Proposal Evaluation Committee (Committee) recommended that the Board of Managers award the next *SafeSpeed* program contract to ACS. I have reviewed both proposals as well as the October 28 memo from the Committee, and I have met and discussed the proposals with the members of the Committee. **I unequivocally endorse the recommendation of the Committee; ACS should be awarded the contract.**

Instead of unnecessarily reiterating the persuasive points made in the Committee's memo authored by Mr. Younes, I offer the following observations:

1. It was abundantly clear to me that ACS has a crystal clear grasp of the program requirements, and their submission was on point, factually supported, and logically organized. By comparison, Brekford's submission was incomplete, disorganized, and unpolished. Brekford's proposal did not inspire confidence.
2. ACS has much deeper experience in automated traffic enforcement systems than does Brekford.
3. ACS's proposal is strong, and the Village would be well served by them (our experience with them has been good already). Based upon Brekford's comparatively thin experience and weak proposal, it would be unwise for the Village to entrust its *SafeSpeed* program to Brekford.
4. Selecting ACS would make transitioning to the new contract very easy. There would be significantly more work involved (and a greater potential for problems) if the Village were to select Brekford.
5. ACS's flat fee arrangement is significantly lower than Brekford's.

I recommend that the automated traffic enforcement contract be awarded to ACS.